UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/824,024 | 04/14/2004 | Billy W. McDaniel | 2003-IP-012882U1 | 5994 |
| 71407 ROBERT A. KI | 7590 06/09/200 E N T | EXAMINER | | |
| P.O. BOX 1431 | | FULLER, ROBERT EDWARD | | |
| DUNCAN, OK | 13330 | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 3676 | |
| | | | | |
| | | | NOTIFICATION DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 06/09/2008 | ELECTRONIC |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ROBERT.KENT1@HALLIBURTON.COM Tammy.Knight@Halliburton.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No. | Applicant(s) | | |
|------------------|-----------------|--|--|
| 10/824,024 | MCDANIEL ET AL. | | |
| Examiner | Art Unit | | |
| ROBERT E. FULLER | 3676 | | |

| | NOBERT E. FOLLER | 3070 | |
|---|--|---|--|
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe | ars on the cover sheet with the c | correspondence add | ress |
| THE REPLY FILED <u>16 May 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPI | LICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL | LOWANCE. | |
| 1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods: | replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance | t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or | hich places the (3) a Request |
| a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing | date of the final rejection. | | |
| b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Arno event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f | ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE). | g date of the final rejection FIRST REPLY WAS FI | on. LED WITHIN TWO |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the s set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL | ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origi | of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic | ate extension fee e action; or (2) as |
| 2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on . A brief in compl | liance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be | filed within two month | s of the date of |
| filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi AMENDMENTS | nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to | avoid dismissal of the | |
| 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b | out prior to the date of filing a brief, | will not be entered be | cause |
| (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further cor | • | ΓE below); | |
| (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below | • | | |
| (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett | er form for appeal by materially red | ducing or simplifying t | ne issues for |
| appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c | corresponding number of finally reig | otod claims | |
| NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). | orresponding number of finally reje | cted claims. | |
| 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 | 21 See attached Notice of Non Co | mpliant Amondment (| DTOL 324) |
| 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): | | mpliant Amendment (| F 10L-324). |
| 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all | | imaly filed amondmor | at cancaling the |
| non-allowable claim(s). | owabie ii subifiitted iii a separate, i | illiely filed afficildifier | it cancelling the |
| 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: | | l be entered and an e | xplanation of |
| Claim(s) allowed: | | | |
| Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: | | | |
| Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: | | | |
| AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE | | | |
| 8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). | I sufficient reasons why the affidavi | t or other evidence is | necessary and |
| 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary | vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea | al and/or appellant fail | s to provide a |
| 10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation | n of the status of the claims after er | ntry is below or attach | ed. |
| REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER | | | |
| 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet. | | condition for allowan | ce because: |
| 12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (13. ☐ Other: | r i 0/5b/06) Paper NO(\$) | | |
| /Jennifer H Gay/ | | | |
| Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3676 | | | |
| | | | |

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments are not persuasive. Applicant has argued that Examiner has completely changed the function of the Whiteley device by saying that the Whiteley device could be used to fracture a formation. Examiner respectfully disagrees. Examiner is simply saying that even when using Whiteley's device under normal operation, it is completely capable of fracturing a formation. Inadvertant fracturing, though undesirable, does in fact occur. The scope of the independent claims is sufficiently broad that a situtation in which Whiteley's device unintentionally fractured a formation (regardless of the size of the fractures) would infringe on the claims. Examiner is not modifying Furthermore, applicant has provided no evidence as to why Whiteley's device is completely incapable of fracturing a formation. Lastly, with regard to applicant's allegation that Whiteley and Akinlade cannot be combined, examiner simply reiterates that Whiteley discloses a stimulation device attached to "drillpipe," and Akinlade simply provides further evidence that a fluid injection device could be used in a drilling operation. The type of fluid being injected does not constitute teaching away from the combination, because the linking element between Whiteley and Akinlade is simply that some fluid is being injected into a formation, regardless of what kind of fluid it is.